

The fundamental and emotional issue of refugee returns comprises the seventh condition. The property laws of both entities in Bosnia must comply with the Dayton Accords. Property commissions must be fully functioning. Both the Federation and the Republika Srpska must be participating in phased and orderly cross-ethnic returns.

The key cities of Sarajevo, Banja Luka, and Mostar must have accepted substantial returns of refugees and displaced persons, and the local police throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina must protect returnees, whatever their religion or ethnicity.

The thorny subject of Brcko comprises the eighth condition needed to be met before all troops can be withdrawn. An arbitration award must have been implemented without violence. As we know, Mr. President, in mid-March the arbitration award on Brcko was postponed for the third time.

Specific benchmarks for Brcko include local elections having been implemented, an integrated police force functioning, two-way refugee returns and ethnic reintegration continuing to progress, and job creation underway.

The ninth condition involves war crimes. All parties to the Dayton Accords, including entity justice authorities, must be cooperating with the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY).

Local authorities must facilitate the apprehension of indictees.

The tenth and final condition necessary for withdrawal of American troops, Mr. President, concerns the relationship of Bosnia with international organizations. One benchmark is certification that local authorities and the entity armies are capable of assuming responsibility for demining operations.

Another is that the Office of the High Representative in Bosnia (OHR) demonstrates its authority to enforce inter-entity agreements without military back-up.

A third, more general, benchmark is that the OSCE, NATO, and the European Union develop more traditional relationships with Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Mr. President, I believe that these detailed conditions and benchmarks show conclusively that the Administration is not asking for an open-ended commitment. It has the exit strategy that critics have long been demanding.

One or two of the ten conditions, and several more of the individual benchmarks have already been met. Many others are well on their way to fulfillment. Many others are only just beginning to be implemented.

And, Mr. President, I would repeat my cautionary word that the fulfillment of such a detailed formulation leaves much open to interpretation.

If the Senate approves this supplemental appropriation for our troops in Bosnia—as I strongly believe it should—we have the right to insist that the Congress be consulted on an

ongoing basis on how the implementation of these civil-military benchmarks is going and also that our NATO and other SFOR partners are continuing to shoulder their responsibilities.

The SFOR mission is of high national security importance for the United States.

We have every right to be pleased with the quite striking progress that has been achieved in Bosnia over the past year. Much remains to be done, and with the game-plan—the “exit strategy” if you will—that the Administration has provided, closer cooperation with Congress is possible.

I urge passage of this supplemental appropriation for both Iraq and Bosnia. I think that it is vital that the Senate and House pass this supplemental as soon as possible. The more expeditiously we act, the less our military readiness will suffer. The brave men and women serving in Bosnia and Iraq deserve to know that their missions are adequately funded by a proud Congress and not by cannibalizing important core military accounts.

For that, they should thank the Senator from Alaska, because he has been absolutely, positively—how can I say it politely—consistent in insisting that we undertake these missions without cannibalizing our core accounts.

Both of these missions further America's national security interests. They have achieved real results and what the Chairman of the full committee is suggesting is the way to go.

I compliment the chairman in being able to fend off the amendments put forward so far today. I wish him luck for the remainder of the process here.

I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Does the Senator from Illinois seek time?

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Yes, only 2 minutes. It was really a very short statement.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator for not to exceed 5 minutes because we want to get to the Wellstone amendment as soon as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

THE TRAGEDY IN JONESBORO, ARKANSAS

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I would like to take a brief moment to express my condolences to the families of the students and teachers killed or wounded during yesterday's tragic shooting at the Westside Middle School in Jonesboro, AR. The Nation's prayers are with those families today and, of course, the thoughts of all Americans are with the people of the Jonesboro community. It is yet another American community whose residents' lives have been changed forever by children who managed to get access to firearms.

The attack yesterday was the third multiple killing in a school by a youth under the age of 16 in the last 6 months. Mr. President, these horrific crimes amply demonstrate that we have a responsibility to oppose the proliferation of violence and to stand fast against any effort to make firearms more freely available. Does anyone in their right mind still believe that it is possible to raise children in a society where guns are so easily obtained? It is clear that we cannot protect our children in such a world. They are such easy prey for those who seek to maim and to kill.

Now, Mr. President, until all the facts have been obtained, it would not be prudent to speculate on the events leading up to the massacre in the school yard yesterday. But this much we do know: We must come together as a society and recommit ourselves to keeping firearms out of the hands of children and guaranteeing that only those people who know how to use guns responsibly have access to them. In order to make our community safer, we must expand programs to train gunowners in the proper use and storage of their weapons.

I believe that responsible gunowners have nothing to fear from reasonable gun laws, and that is what I think we need to have a debate and talk about, and that is what the majority of us who support reasonable gun control seek to have happen—laws that will help to keep tragedies like the one that happened yesterday in that small community in Arkansas from ever happening again. I think it is appropriate for us to have that debate, given the importance to our children, to their safety, to our liberty and freedom and safety in our communities.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN was speaking about the shooting in Jonesboro, and I have not said anything on the floor about that. I would like 2 minutes to follow up on that.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arkansas be recognized for 2 minutes, and following that, the Senator from Ohio be recognized for not to exceed 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

THE TRAGEDY IN JONESBORO, ARKANSAS

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, let me just, first of all, express my profound thanks to the distinguished Senator from Illinois for her sensitivity and sincere compassion over what is the most traumatic event, perhaps ever, in my State. We have tornadoes and we lose a lot of lives in tornadoes, and we have a lot of property damage. But for just sheer trauma, this event is really

unique to us, as it would be to any State in the Nation. The grief is indescribable. The circumstances are indescribable. Nobody could speculate with any degree of accuracy as to what possesses an 11- or 13-year-old child to do this. You can wonder how did they lay their hands on such an arsenal of weapons in order to perpetrate the crime? But at this point, I share the comments of the Senator from Illinois that it is premature to speculate on that because that will all come out as the investigation goes forward and is unwound.

I simply want to say that it is a terrible plight in this country when such an event can even be thinkable, let alone happen. It is becoming all too frequent that you pick up the paper and find that this is happening in the school yards of America. This is not a high school, this is a middle school of 11-, 12-, and 13-year-old youngsters. Nineteen were injured and five are dead. It is an unspeakable horror. I know I speak for all the Members of the Senate in expressing our sincere grief, our condolences and sincere sympathies to all the people who have been affected in this, the parents and relatives of the children who have been injured and killed, and to those others who were not but will be traumatized and scarred by this for the rest of their lives.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

(The remarks of Mr. DEWINE pertaining to the introduction of S. 1862 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATURAL DISASTERS AND OVERSEAS PEACEKEEPING EFFORTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Minnesota now has an amendment that is on the list.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I will be calling up amendment No. 2128, and ask that it be modified with the language that is at the desk right now.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, will the Senator agree to some sort of a time agreement?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I think I can do this in 30 minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEVENS. Let's get this straight. The Senator wants 30 minutes total on the amendment equally divided.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I would like to have 30 minutes to speak on this. I wasn't aware that there would be opposition.

Mr. STEVENS. I am not sure there will be. I have to reserve some time in case there is someone on this side.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I may be able to do it in less time, but I have been wanting to speak about the IMF amendment. I will try to do it in less. But I would like now to reserve 30 minutes. At one point in time, as my good friend from Alaska knows, I had four amendments.

Mr. STEVENS. Is the Senator prepared to withdraw the other three amendments?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I say to my colleague from Alaska, I will withdraw the other three amendments. And then I would like to have an agreement that I would have 30 minutes with no second degree on this amendment, which I think will generate widespread support.

Mr. STEVENS. I am not prepared to agree that some Senator will not come in with a second-degree amendment. I will not present a second-degree amendment myself. I would like the Senator, if he would agree, to withdraw the other three amendments—the Senator has 30 minutes—and 10 minutes in case we need it.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I can't agree to a time limit if I can't get agreement on a second-degree amendment. I ask unanimous consent that I be able to move to this amendment and that there be no second-degree amendments.

Mr. STEVENS. I can't do that. I will have to object. Mr. President, I cannot accept that. I have not read the amendment myself. I will do that now.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I think I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. I have the floor. I would like to work this out.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Alaska will yield for a moment, while he is checking the amendment, I wonder if I might, without he yielding the floor, take 4 minutes while he is looking at the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Will the Senator from Alaska give me 4 minutes while he is looking at this?

Mr. STEVENS. This is a modification of the amendment sent to the desk. I am trying to figure out if there would be a second-degree amendment to it. I am informed that it is modified and that we would not have a second-degree amendment. And I am prepared to agree to the Senator's suggestion of 30 minutes for him. I still want to reserve 10 minutes on this side in case someone wants to speak on it to answer the Senator. I do not intend to do that. But I then ask unanimous consent that the Senator be recognized to call up amendment No. 2128, as modified, and that he have 30 minutes, and we re-

serve 10 minutes on this side. My advice to the Senator would be to yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Reserving the right to object, would he be willing to modify that to give me the first 3 minutes on the pending amendment before he brings up his amendment?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am pleased to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. STEVENS. What happens? The Senator gets 5 minutes. The Senator from Minnesota gets 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont will have 3 minutes to speak with respect to the amendment previously offered, followed by the Senator from Minnesota to speak with respect to the amendment which he is prepared to modify, for 30 minutes, followed by up to 10 minutes in response to his amendment.

Mr. WELLSTONE. With no second degree.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There would be no second-degree amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the agreement, the Senator from Vermont is now recognized for up to 3 minutes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2130

Mr. LEAHY. I tell my friend, the Presiding Officer, if I could have the attention of the Presiding Officer, I will not give a great speech but a small speech.

Mr. President, just a few weeks after we pushed the U.N. Security Council to support strong resolutions against Iraq, we are on the amendment by the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina proposing ways to further undercut the effectiveness of the United Nations and our leadership in the United Nations. In regular U.N. peacekeeping operations, blue helmet operations, we sought reimbursement for our in-kind contributions, and we are reimbursed today. But there are many other U.N. operations that have the blessings of the Security Council but are not actually U.N. peacekeeping operations, including U.N. troops that were included because it was important to the United States interests.

I will give you an example. Operation Provide Comfort in northern Iraq is an example. The United Nations has given its blessing because we, the United States, asked the United Nations to support it. But it is, above all else, as we all know, a U.S. operation.

There are other examples where we pushed for a U.N. Security Council resolution in support of our position to give a broader degree of support. But if the United Nations were to adopt all of these operations as its own, I expect that the Senator from North Carolina would probably be the first to object. I doubt he would want our troops to be wearing blue helmets in those operations.

As Senator BIDEN has said, maybe we should seek to change the U.N. charter